



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/842,082	04/26/2001	Jae Kyung Lee	P-222	6941
34610	7590	04/19/2005		
FLESHNER & KIM, LLP P.O. BOX 221200 CHANTILLY, VA 20153			EXAMINER RAMAN, USHA	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2616	
DATE MAILED: 04/19/2005				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

09/842,082

Applicant(s)

LEE ET AL.

Examiner

Usha Raman

Art Unit

2616

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 April 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-15, and 18-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hayward et al. (US. Pat. 6,629,134) in view of Lortz (US Pat. 6,505,243)

In regards to claims 1 and 10, Hayward discloses a system for providing the user of a computer peripheral function information (guided tour, interactive demonstration of peripheral operation) and error check up menu (upon occurrences of error conditions) of the product by using a proper information (peripheral indicia) and contact information (i.e. product website site) of the product. The system comprises means to automatically detect the product indicia in case of an error and establish communications with a support site, and therefore inherently stores the proper information and the contact information in order to establish communication with the product site. See abstract, column 5, lines 10-19, and lines 53-57.

Hayward only discloses that the product comprises a computer peripheral and does not disclose a television in communication with the computer system.

Lortz discloses a system for providing support information about devices of a home network, including a television coupled to a computer system. See figure 2 and column 4, lines 15-31.

It would have obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the system of Hayward, by setting a home network of plurality of consumer electronics devices (such as a television) coupled to the computer system as a computer "peripheral" device, thereby to providing support information for all the devices coupled to a computer on a home network, including a television.

In regards to claims 2 and 11, Hayward discloses diagnosing an error, and receiving measures on about the error in order to restore the error automatically when the error restoring information exits (see Hayward: column 5, lines 10-19, lines 65-67, and column 6, lines 1-4, where the error is restored by showing the user how to replace an ink cartridge).

In regards to claim 3, Hayward discloses launching a communications browser to connect with a server site for product support to a particular peripheral condition (i.e. a specific query or error condition). See abstract, column 6, lines 26-47.

In regards to claim 4, Hayward discloses that in response to establishing communications with product site, additional information for helping the user through the peripheral condition is sent from the server. See column 6, lines 47-57.

In regards to 5, Hayward discloses transmitting "proper" information (peripheral indicia) identifying the product to the server. See column 3, lines 65-67 and column 4, lines 1-11.

In regards to claim 6, Hayward discloses establishing a connection to service site over the Internet using a network interface device such as a modem. See column 3, lines 4-11.

In regards to claim 7, Hayward discloses that the proper information (peripheral indicial) is a model name or model number of the product. See abstract and column 3, lines 65-67 and column 4, lines 1-2.

In regards to claim 8, Hayward discloses that the contact information is a URL to the manufacturer's site. See column 6, lines 31-41.

In regards to claims 9 and 19, Hayward discloses that the product support information includes guided tour and demonstration of the peripheral operation. Therefore when the peripheral coupled on the home network comprise a television, the guided tour and demonstration of the peripheral operation would pertain to information corresponding to audio/video related function of the television.

In regards to claim 12, Hayward discloses that during registration as well when requesting product information, information is sent when the user clicks on a 'send' button during registration or when the user selects a particular type of support information (i.e. select a product demonstration button, via menu). See column 4, lines 5-11 and column 5, lines 42-61.

In regards to claim 13, during a normal operation of a television, the TV receives and processes broadcast signal. Therefore the modified system is operative to receive and process a broadcast signal when an error condition has not occurred.

In regards to claim 14, Hayward discloses that support menu from the manufacturer's site provide function information menu (such as guided tours, demonstration on product) as well as error check up menu. See column 5, lines 10-19 and lines 31-57.

In regards to claim 15, Hayward discloses the step of diagnosing an error, and receiving measures on about the error in order to restore the error automatically when the error restoring information exits (see Hayward: column 5, lines 10-19, lines 65-67, and column 6, lines 1-4, where the error is restored by showing the user how to replace an ink cartridge). Hayward further teaches that it is well known to give a wide variety of error conditions upon occurrence of an error condition. See column 1, lines 63-67 and column 2, lines 1-7.

In regards to claim 20, Hayward discloses that when the system contacts during an error condition, the user is directed to a specific "peripheral condition" site indicated by the peripheral indicia (that directs it to the appropriate product). See column 5, lines 56-47. However, if no peripheral condition occurs, the system does not comprise a peripheral condition or product indicia to report and therefore when the user accesses the manufacturer's site, will be directed to a manufacturer's general site.

In regards to claim 18, Hayward discloses the step of displaying a list of functions corresponding to the product (i.e. menu allowing users to make various selections on product related service). See column 5, lines 35-57.

3. Claim 16 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hayward et al. (US. Pat. 6,629,134) in view of Lortz (US Pat. 6,505,243) as applied to claim 15 above, and further in view of IBM Technical Disclosure Bulletin, entitled, "Real-Time Error Mapping of a Memory Basic Storage Module or System with No Performance Degradation to the System".

In regards to claim 16, the modified system does not teach the step of adding a error information to a list of errors when it does not exist in the list. The IBM Bulletin discloses the step of logging a new error and its characteristics when it does not match known error characteristics. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use the teachings from the IBM bulletin by logging a new type of error when it is encountered and adding it to the list of errors. The motivation is to report a new error or a bug to the product manufacturer.

4. Claim 17 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hayward et al. (US. Pat. 6,629,134) in view of Lortz (US Pat. 6,505,243) as applied to claim 15 above, and further in view of Kaneko (JP 06008594 A).

In regards to claim 17, the modified system does not disclose contacting a serviceman for repair upon the occurrence of a fatal error.

Kaneko teaches the step of contacting a serviceman for repair upon the occurrence of a fatal issue. See abstract.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to further modify the system to request a repair from a service man when a fatal error is encountered. The motivation is to request the serviceman to repair an issue that cannot be automatically resolved.

### ***Conclusion***

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Usha Raman whose telephone number is (571) 272-7380. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri: 9am-6pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Andrew Faile can be reached on (571) 272-7375. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Application/Control Number: 09/842,082

Page 8

Art Unit: 2616

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Andrew Faile".

ANDREW FAILE  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600

UR  
03-21-05